

BUSH DOCTRINE REVEALED (JANUARY 2005)

It took a tsunami for me to realize I had seriously underestimated the Bush Doctrine. I thought George W was merely a leading-edge baby boomer, interested in immediate gain--the future be damned, or at least the future had to take care of itself. I now realize Bush's presidential actions have focused on the twin long-term goals of world domination by the United States and political domination by Republicans.

I know; all this from a legacy "C" student. One must rip away the obfuscatory layer of malapropisms and mispronounced words to gain understanding: a difficult task, but worth the effort.

Despite campaign rhetoric stating (or misstating) terrorist "nu-cue-ler" attack was the biggest threat to the United States, Bush correctly understands Pacific Rim countries collectively present the biggest concern, with their massive populations and burgeoning economies. The Bush Doctrine deals directly and indirectly with this threat.

For example, why would a Republican dominated House, Senate and White House slash taxes and increase spending in order to create the largest annual and cumulative deficits in history? Even promises to "cut the deficit in half" mean the cumulative deficit will continue to grow, only at a slower pace.

Look at who buys the Bush debt. Latest government figures show of the \$800 billion Bush debt held by investors, foreign governments bought (drum roll) \$800 billion, much of it by the targeted Pacific Rim countries.

This is a sucker play. Huge deficits over many years lead to inflation. Inflation causes the purchasing power of the dollar to decline. When foreign governments turn in their bonds, the United States pays them back with cheap dollars. Plus, if we can no longer afford to buy their exports with our worthless dollars, their economies tank.

Unfortunately for the Bush Doctrine, the financial markets may have gotten wise to this one and are starting to sell dollars. The foreign governments are stuck though. If they try to sell their \$800 billion, the dollar will spiral down like some banana republic's currency, causing them even greater losses.

Fine, you say, but what about the push to bring democracy to the world? A wolf in sheep's clothing. Traditionally the most stable governments have been authoritarian. People may not like them. They may be inefficient, sucking off resources for massive prison systems, developing tax policies that favor those in power, providing subsidies for large corporations, developing a large difference between the wealthy and the poor. But, until there is a revolution, they are stable.

It is much easier to compete with instability and that's where the Bush Doctrine on Democracy comes in. By foisting democracy on countries with little history of self-government, it ensures a multitude of parties, none of which can dominate. Political struggles sap the country's energy, sometimes even leading to civil war and Balkanization. If a country focuses internally, it can't compete globally. You get

the drift.

Sometimes countries are slow in picking up the democracy idea and need a little push--for example, Afghanistan and Iraq. Wars are helpful in maintaining instability and, an added bonus, they increase the deficit in a manner even the most fiscally conservative person can't vote against.

As an aside, we learned the democracy bit from the Brits, who loosed it on all their former colonies with predictable results. Ceding Hong Kong to China introduced the virus to the mainland--incubation period unknown, nor is the seriousness of the illness--but I digress.

How did the tsunami bring these ideas into focus? It showed the true brilliance of a major tactic Bush is utilizing to implement his Doctrine: accelerate global warming. I know, the official policy does not admit to global warming, but really, who is kidding whom?

What are the major effects of global warming? Ignoring the short-term impacts of more severe weather systems throughout the world (instability again), one of the most important results is the melting of the Polar ice caps, raising the level of the world's oceans. Bush has gone all out to accomplish this major objective.

He scuttled U.S. participation in the Kyoto treaty; coal-fired plants are allowed to delay installing scrubbers and continue to spew pollutants; West Virginia mountains are leveled to utilize more coal; drilling in the Arctic is pushed ahead to assure polluting oil is burned, rather than funneling research monies into solar technologies and fuel cells.

If the oceans rise, say ten or fifty feet, the cities of the Pacific Rim countries will drown by a slow-motion tsunami (an oxymoron, but we are talking about Bush Doctrine), destroying any possibility of economically rivaling the United States.

What about our East and West coasts, you ask? Won't they be affected too? Certainly, revealing the beauty of the Bush Doctrine: Parallel results. Remember red and blue states? Devastation will strike California, Oregon and Washington on the left coast, and liberal New England and the Mid-Atlantic through Maryland will be underwater.

I hear you saying, "But it won't affect everyone in those states." The answer shows real subtlety in the Bush Doctrine. Cities are at the water's edge; suburbs are in the surrounding hills. Democrats drown; Republicans prosper and the whole country turns red.

There will be some collateral damage in the red coastal Southern states. Long-term planning will save the day. Resettlement camps are already designed for the flattened West Virginia mountains.